A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) to (*f*) The Government regret that it is not possible to disclose the information in the public interests.

Scheme for timely restoration and maintenance of tanks.

Q.—412. Sri K. PRABHAKAR (Nelamangala—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether they have got any scheme for the timely restoration and maintenance of tanks in the State;

(*b*) who will operate the working of the bulldozers in matters of desilting the tanks;

(*c*) whether the work of desilting the tanks by bulldozers is successful and profitable?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Agricultural Engineer and the Operational Staff, under the control of the Commissioner for Food Production.

(*c*) Yes. In particular cases.

DISQUALIFICATION ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN INCURRED BY SRI T. SIDDALINGAIYA.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As suggested by me on the 31st of last month, I now request Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy and after him Sri T. Siddalingaiya to briefly state what they have to say on the question of disqualification of Sri T. Siddalingaiya, raised by Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli—Gudibanda).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for affording me an opportunity to make a statement on the question of disqualification of Sri T. Siddalingaiya from being a member of this Honourable House.

Sir, I am sure you will appreciate the difficulty I am labouring under, in collecting the relevant information relating to the contract for the transport of copper wire from Dehoodepet near Poona to Bangalore, entrusted to the firm Shri Shankar & Company. Sri T. Siddalingaiya who was then the Minister for Electricity was responsible for this contract being given to this firm at a very high rate. As the recent events have shown, this resulted in his resignation from the Cabinet.

Sir, you have rightly pointed out in your ruling that when a question of his qualification is not free from doubt, a reference for the decision of Rajpramukh should not be shut out.

From the information, both oral and documentary, in my possession I will be able to show that Sri T. Siddalingaiya's undivided brother was a partner in Sri Shankar & Co. Sri T. Siddalingaiya, in his letter, dated 4th February 1953 to the Chief Minister, has stated as follows:—

> "..... another point for consideration is the relationship of my brother with Sri Shankar & Co., whose tender has been accepted. It is true that I said before the Party that my brother was a partner in the said firm. But subsequent enquiries showed the real state of affairs. One of the partners of Sri Shankar & Co., was a worker under my brother several years ago. His association in the said company made me feel that my brother must also have been there and led me to make the statement that I did. I regret that my over anxiety to be above board made me make that hasty statement. Now I know that there is documentary evidence to show that my brother is not a partner .....".

This is highly revealing.

It indicates Sri T. Siddalingaiya's attempt to get out of the inconvenient situation created by his own admission at the special meeting of the